OIPE COLOR DATE DATE LABEI No. Dated:

06-03-05 IFW

Docket No.: 03191/000J838-US0

(PATENT)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:

W. Reik et al.

Application No.: 09/982,136

Confirmation No.: 7044

Filed: October 12, 2001

Art Unit: 3682

For: MOTOR VEHICLE

Examiner: J. K. Smith

REQUEST FOR WITHDRAWAL OF NOTICE OF ABANDONMENT

MS Petition Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Responsive to the Notice of Abandonment mailed May 23, 2005, Applicants respectfully assert that for the following reasons, the withdrawal of the holding of abandonment is in order.

Applicants in the above-identified patent application have received a Notice of Abandonment, dated May 23, 2005, copy enclosed as Exhibit A, advising that the application is abandoned due to Applicants' failure to timely respond to the Office Letter mailed October 13, 2004.

For the reasons set forth below, Applicants believe that the Notice of Abandonment is in error or due to actions by the USPTO and should be withdrawn. More specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that there was no outstanding Office Action that required a formal response by Applicants and thus, the Notice of Abandonment is in error since it refers to the Office Action dated October 13, 2004 as requiring a response by Applicants, thereby forming the basis for the alleged abandonment.

Application No.: 09/982,136

2

The only communication dated October 13, 2004 is the Examiner's Answer which is enclosed herewith, as Exhibit B. The Examiner's Answer was mailed subsequent to and in response to Applicant's Appeal Brief which was filed on July 8, 2004.

Applicants believe that a recitation of the applicable patent rules governing patent appeals is in order.

37 C.F.R. 41.39 is the applicable patent rule for the Examiner's Answer and states in part:

- (2) An examiner's answer may include a new ground of rejection.
- (b) If an examiner's answer contains a rejection designated as a new ground of rejection, appellant must within two months from the date of the examiner's answer exercise one of the following two options to avoid sua sponte dismissal of the appeal as to the claims subject to the new ground of rejection: (Emphasis Added)
- 37 C.F.R. 41.41 is the applicable patent rule section for the filing of a Reply Brief. In part this section states:
 - (a)(1) Appellant may file a reply brief to an examiner's answer within two months from the date of the examiner's answer. (Emphasis Added)

Moreover, 37 C.F.R. 41.47 is the applicable patent rule section for oral hearings. In part this section states:

- (a) An oral hearing should be requested only in those circumstances in which appellant considers such a hearing necessary or desirable for a proper presentation of the appeal. An appeal decided on the briefs without an oral hearing will receive the same consideration by the Board as appeals decided after an oral hearing.
- (b) If appellant desires an oral hearing, appellant must file, as a separate paper captioned "REQUEST FOR ORAL HEARING," a

written request for such hearing accompanied by the fee set forth in § 41.20(b)(3) within two months from the date of the examiner's answer or supplemental examiner's answer. (Emphasis Added)

As is clear from the Examiner's Answer contained in Exhibit B, the Examiner's Answer does <u>not</u> contain any new ground of rejection of the claims. In paragraph (10) of the Examiner's Answer, there are two grounds of rejection listed, namely, that claims 1-5, 7-8, and 6-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hardeman et al. in view of Machida et al., as well as claims 9-11 being rejected as being unpatentable over Hardeman et al. in view of Machida et al. and further in view of Burkett. However, the Examiner has indicated that <u>both of these grounds</u> of rejection were set forth in a prior Office Action mailed on January 13, 2004. Thus, it is clear that since these were the only grounds of rejection, there are <u>no</u> new grounds of rejection in the Examiner's answer. Thus, the provisions of 37 C.F.R. 41.39 (2)(b) do not apply in the present situation since there were <u>no</u> new grounds of rejection. As a result, there was non-extendable two month time period for applicants to exercise one of the two stated options.

Contrary to what is stated in the Notice of Abandonment and since the Office letter mailed October 13, 2004 did <u>not</u> require a response, Applicants were under <u>no</u> duty to file a response. Instead and in view of Applicant's decision not to request an oral hearing, the present appeal should have assigned for consideration and decision on the briefs without an oral hearing.

Application No.: 09/982,136 4 Docket No.: 03191/000J838-US0

For these reasons, it is respectfully requested that the Notice of Abandonment be withdrawn. Since the alleged abandonment is improper and did not result from any action or lack of action by the Applicants, it is believed that no fee is due with the present request. If this is not the case, it is earnestly requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned.

Dated: June 1, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

Edward J. Ellis

Registration No.: 40,389

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(212) 527-7700

(212) 753-6237 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEFARATIMENT OF COINT United States Patient and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 09/982,136 10/12/2001 Wolfgang Reik 3191/OJ838 7044 7278 7590 05/23/2005 **EXAMINER** DARBY & DARBY P.C. SMITH, JULIE KNECHT P. O. BOX 5257 NEW YORK, NY 10150-5257 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 3682 DATE MAILED: 05/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Notice of Abandonme	4	09/982,136	REIK ET AL.			
. Notice of Abandonme	ent	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Julie K Smith	0000			
The MAILING DATE of this co	mmunication an		With the correspondence add			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address This application is abandoned in view of:						
Applicant's failure to timely file a prope (a) ☐ A reply was received on (with period for reply (including a total ex	h a Certificate of I tension of time of	Mailing or Transmission dat month(s)) which ex	ted), which is after the expired on			
(b) A proposed reply was received on, but it does not constitute a proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (a) to the final rejection.						
(A proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 application in condition for allowand Continued Examination (RCE) in co	3 to a final rejections; (2) a timely file	n consists only of: (1) a tim d Notice of Appeal (with ap	ely filed amendment which place	es the		
(c) A reply was received on but it does not constitute a proper reply, or a bona fide attempt at a proper reply, to the non-final rejection. See 37 CFR 1.85(a) and 1.111. (See explanation in box 7 below).						
(d) ⊠ No reply has been received.						
2. Applicant's failure to timely pay the required issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, within the statutory period of three months from the mailing date of the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85).						
(a) The issue fee and publication fee,), which is after the expiration Allowance (PTOL-85).	if applicable, was of the statutory p	s received on (with eriod for payment of the iss	a Certificate of Mailing or Tran sue fee (and publication fee) set	smission dated in the Notice of		
(b) ☐ The submitted fee of \$ is insufficient. A balance of \$ is due.						
The issue fee required by 37 CFR	1.18 is \$	The publication fee, if requi	red by 37 CFR 1.18(d), is \$			
(c) ☐ The issue fee and publication fee, if	applicable, has no	ot been received.	() / () / ()			
3. Applicant's failure to timely file corrected Allowability (PTO-37).	l drawings as requ	uired by, and within the thre	ee-month period set in, the Notic	e of		
(a) Proposed corrected drawings were after the expiration of the period for	received on reply.	(with a Certificate of Maili	ng or Transmission dated), which is		
(b) ☐ No corrected drawings have been re	eceived.		. '			
4. ☐ The letter of express abandonment which the applicants.	ch is signed by the	e attorney or agent of recor	d, the assignee of the entire inte	rest, or all of		
5. The letter of express abandonment whi 1.34(a)) upon the filing of a continuing a	ch is signed by an opplication.	attorney or agent (acting i	n a representative capacity unde	er 37 CFR		
6. The decision by the Board of Patent Ap of the decision has expired and there are	peals and Interfere e no allowed clair	ence rendered on are	nd because the period for seekin	g court review		
7. The reason(s) below:			Def 51	18/5		
			TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600	foot 1 t		
			JKS 5/5/05			
Petitions to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(a) or (b), or requests to withdraw the holding of abandonment under 37 CFR 1.181, should be promptly filed to minimize any negative effects on patent term.						
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-1432 (Rev. 04-01)	Notice o	f Abandonment	Part of Pane	er No. 050505		



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.usplo.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

MAILED

OCT 13 2004

Application Number: 09/982,136 Filing Date: October 12, 2001 Appellant(s): REIK ET AL. GROUP 3600

ED

OCT 13 2004

Edward J. Ellis

GROUP 3600

For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 7/8/04.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences, which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Invention

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Issues

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

(7) Grouping of Claims

The rejection of claims 1-5 and 7-16 stand or fall together because appellant's brief does not include a statement that this grouping of claims does not stand or fall together and reasons in support thereof. See 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7).

(8) Claims Appealed

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(9) Prior Art of Record

5,267,488	Hardeman et al.	12-1993
4,719,812	Machida et al.	1-1988
5,566,591	Burkett	10-1996

(10) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-5, 7-8 and 6-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hardeman et al. (5,267,488) in view of Machida et al. (4,719,812). This rejection is set forth in a prior Office Action, mailed on 1/13/04.

Claims 9-11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hardeman et al. in view of Machida et al., as applied to claims 1-5, 7-8 and 6-12 above, and further in view of Burkett (5,566,591). This rejection is set forth in a prior Office Action, mailed on 1/13/04.

(11)Response to Argument

Appellant first argues that Hardeman et al. lacks a control device to control the clutch in an automated mode. The Examiner agrees that the Hardeman et al. reference lacks this feature, however, the rejections are not based upon 35 USC 102, but rather, are based on 35 USC 103. In order to teach the obviousness of controlling the clutch of Hardeman et al. in an automated mode, the examiner relies upon the teachings of Machida et al. Machida et al. teach to one of ordinary skill in the art the obviousness of operating a clutch in an automated mode (see col. 2, line 34 through col. 3, line 37) wherein at least portions of one of the clutch actuator device and control device are integrated into a carrier element (29, see col. 3, lines 62-68). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the teachings of Machida et al. to include portions of at least one of the clutch actuator device and the control device in the carrier element of Hardeman et al. in order to automate actuation of the clutch. Appellant's reasoning is further based upon the argument that the elements 11-13 of Machida et al. are on the outside of the transmission. This is incorrect as the elements are located on a carrier element (29) attached to and extending into the transmission casing (28) of Machida et al. (see Fig. 7 and col. 3, lines 38-67).

Next, Appellant argues that the reference to Machida et al. does not address the problems solved by Appellant. Obviousness is not determined solely by whether or not the reference combination solves any stated problem; rather, it is determined by whether or not it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the primary reference to achieve the claimed invention. In the instant case, the issue is whether or not it would have been obvious to automate the clutch of Hardeman et al. in view of the teachings of Machida et al. As Machida et al. teach to one of ordinary skill in the art the automating of a clutch in the manner claimed, the reference combination is proper.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted.

JKS

JKS

October 1, 2004

Conferees:

David Bucci :

Jack Lavinder

Julie Smith

Chong Kim

DARBY & DARBY P.C. P. O. BOX 5257

NEW YORK, NY 10150-5257

ŗ



Application No. (if known): 09/982,136

Attorney Docket No.: 03191/000J838-US0

Certificate of Express Mailing Under 37 CFR 1.10

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as Express Mail, Airbill No. in an envelope addressed to:

= 432860673 - us

MS Petition Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on <u>June 1, 2005</u> Date

B.w.	Ree		
Signatu	ire		
B.w.	. E E		
Typed or printed name of person signing Certificate			
Registration Number, if applicable	Telephone Number		

Note: Each paper must have its own certificate of mailing, or this certificate must identify each submitted paper.

Request for Withdrawal of Notice of Abandonment (4 pages)

Exhibit A (2 pages) Exhibit B (5 pages) Return Postcard

This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning Operations and is not part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:			
☐ BLACK BORDERS			
☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES			
FADED TEXT OR DRAWING			
BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING			
☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES			
☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS			
☐ GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS			
☐ LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT			
☐ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY			
OTHER:			

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.